

June 2019

A Proposed Literature-Based Syllabus for EAP Writing

Kyle Perkins

Florida International University, perkinsk@fiu.edu

Xuan Jiang

Florida International University, xjiang0418@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jger>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

This Refereed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the M3 Center at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Global Education and Research by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Perkins, K., & Jiang, X. (2019). A Proposed Literature-Based Syllabus for EAP Writing. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 3(1). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jger/vol3/iss1/7>

Corresponding Author

Xuan Jiang, Email address: xjiang0418@gmail.com Telephone Number: 305-348-2127 Postal Address: 11200 SW 8th St. Modesto A. Maidique Campus Center for Excellence in Writing GL 124E Miami, FL 33199

A Proposed Literature-Based Syllabus for EAP Writing

Cover Page Footnote

NA

Introduction

Over a million international students have enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities since 2015 (Institute of International Education, 2018). Such a large and continuously growing number of international students have established the United States as the first leading host country of overseas students for years. Many of these students who are nonnative English-speaking (NNES) learners are required to take English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses, particularly, EAP writing courses, because of their English language proficiency being lower than their university admission's requirement (Dooey, 2010). Despite the huge number of NNES students taking EAP in U.S. universities, relatively few research studies have been conducted focusing on EAP writing courses for this student population. Moreover, the relationship between native English-speaking (NES) learners' reading and writing has been widely researched for decades; however, the connections between NNES learners' reading and writing have not received the same level of theoretical and empirical analysis and attention in the research literature. Because this subgroup of students is underrepresented in the research literature, the purpose of this paper, therefore, is to propose a literature-based writing course for advanced NNES students and to provide a rationale, a syllabus, and some pedagogy for consideration, for the sake of establishing a bridge between theory and practice.

Literature Review

Reading-Writing Similarities

There is a close relationship between reading and writing. To illustrate this close relationship, Lems, Miller, and Soro (2017) provide a list of similarities between the English reading and writing processes both of which are "the cornerstones of academic success" -- various genres involved, connections between phonemes and graphemes, "component processes enfolded", information processing, context reduced, and more complex structures than oral English (p. 230). Other researchers (Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991; Tierney & Pearson, 1983) view reading and writing as virtually similar processes of meaning construction.

Writing Improves and is Improved by Reading

Reading and writing are not only similar, but also interactive. Numerous studies have reported that good readers make good writers (Spivey, 1984; Spivey & King, 1989) and good writers tend to be good readers (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; Strickland, 1991). Similarly, other studies have confirmed the close associations between reading and writing proficiency development (Grabe, 2003; Tierney & Pearson, 1983).

Many first-year college students, who have been taught to read passively and receptively in high school, were studied and were found not to be proficient in critical reading comprehension (Larson, Britt & Larson, 2004). Neff-van Aertselaer (2013) suggests "students need instruction for critical thinking in academic reading [because] (they generally accept the views put forward in any published text)" (p. 199). They need to be trained to read actively and critically, to interpret complex texts and to construct knowledge as they read (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Downs, 2000; Valeri-Gold & Deming, 2000). Usually, students are not required to enroll in "stand-alone reading courses" (Bosley, 2008, p. 285), but their academic writing assignments, which are based on preliminary reading, constitute real-life challenges (Baba, 2009). Moreover, both academic reading and writing are the most challenging components for students and have "the greatest impact" on their academic performance (Mazgutova & Kormos, 2015, p.7). Evidence-based research has shown that reading-based writing is an important component of disciplinary-wide academic training (Baba, 2009; Carson, 2001). As a possible consequence of the aforementioned empirical studies, scholars have begun to incorporate reading as a component

of the composing process models (Baba, 2009; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996), and this is another reason for developing this paper (i.e., to provide a bridge between theory and practice). After conducting a thorough review of the reading-writing nexus, Tierney and Shanahan (1990) concluded “writing and reading together engage learners in a greater variety of reasoning operations than when writing and reading are apart or when students are given a variety of tasks to go along with their reading” (p. 272). Furthermore, Graham and Hebert (2010) propose:

Students’ reading skills and comprehension are improved by learning the skills and processes that go into creating texts, specifically when teachers teach the process of writing, text structures for writing, paragraph or sentence construction (improves reading comprehension), teach spelling and sentence construction skills (improves reading fluency, [and] teach spelling skills (improves word reading skills) (p. 5).

Extended writing about a text or texts exerts a strong impact on reading comprehension, because it provides greater opportunities to generate, develop, transform, and polish ideas in a text, requires students to synthesize and streamline the ideas on to a paper as a coherent, cohesive, and holistic piece, and promotes intrapersonal reflection and interpersonal communications with and via texts (Graham & Herbert, 2010).

RFW for NNEST Writers

Reading for Writing (RFW) is a phase “referring most specifically to the literacy act in which readers/writers use text(s) that they read, or have read, as a basis for text(s) that they write” (Carson, 1993, p. 85). RFW is expected from college students, who “are not often asked to write without some kind of stimulus or input, usually in the form of reading materials (i.e. source texts)” (Hirvela, 2016, p. 127). In this sense, RFW is “an index of successful academic achievement for students” (Shaw & Pecorari, 2013, A1).

Unlike NES, NNEST students write differently, “from word formation, to sentence structure, to organization” (Matsuda & Cox, 2009, p.43). Moreover, there are the issues of “normative” language use and “intuition”. One difficulty that NNEST students experience in the composing process is that they have little knowledge about the normative in language use and even less intuition about the correctness and completeness of English syntax, word choice, and tone. Furthermore, abilities of commanding “normative” language use and composing grammatical sentences do not equal to “the ability to compose full compositions” (Matsuda & Cox, 2009, p. 45).

Reading can build a sense of normative (Irmischer, 1979). RFW can provide background and source material for writing about a specific topic, and readings can be used as templates or models for students to imitate (Kroll, 1993; Wright, 2015). RFW should also build NNEST learners’ intuition about language for the following reasons. RFW would expose NNEST students to a wide range of genres, syntactic constructions, discourse structures, and words and word families (both content and function words), with a broad spectrum of low- and high-frequency words and a broad distribution of word frequencies across subject matter areas (see Perkins & Linnville (1987) for more information). In written texts, one can expect to encounter low-frequency or even arcane words, more abstract words than concrete words, and structural and function words which are rarely, if ever, heard in oral English.

RFW and Multiple-Documents Literacy

RFW should lead to development of multiple-documents literacy. Bråten and Strømsø (2010) define multiple-documents literacy as “the ability to locate, evaluate, and use diverse sources of information for the purpose of constructing and communicating an integrated, meaningful representation of a particular issue, subject, or situation” (p. 635). In addition, Bråten and

Strømsø note that there is a range of higher-order processes and skills associated with multiple-documents literacy, such as, resorting to prior knowledge, sourcing, deeper-level strategies use, “task awareness, documentary expertise, and personal epistemology” (2010, pp. 635-636). This definition mentions skills that are required during reading comprehension and the composing process, in addition to critical thinking. The syllabus presented in this paper does not involve documents per se, only texts, but the same principles apply to texts. For example, one of the writing assignments in the proposed syllabus is “How do the portraits of Henry Ford differ in Dos Passos and Doctorow?”

Rationale from the Authors’ L2 Perspective

The proposed syllabus, shown in Appendix A, is designed for advanced EAP writing students. Before the syllabus is presented, the authors’ presuppositions will be stated about what “advanced” means in terms of writing proficiency. At the advanced level, it is assumed that students have competence in sentential grammar, inter-sentential grammar, and paragraphing. It is further assumed that students are competent in the use of structure vocabulary to signal logical organization and various logical relationships. What is left at the advanced level is much work on selecting and ordering ideas, developing and supporting ideas, finding a thesis statement, establishing cohesion and coherence, learning different genres of academic writing, adequate knowledge of the principles of expository prose and source attribution, and clear understanding of the difference between fact and opinion (Bhowmik & Kim, 2018), all of which are the tasks with which college students are confronted in an academic setting every day (Bhowmik & Kim, 2018). Accordingly, those aspects are the foci in developing the syllabus.

Methods

This section of the paper addresses the following topics: (1) culturally responsive teaching; (2) building vocabulary; (3) a cognitive method based on active thinking; (4) a cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction developed by Olson (2003), which is a model of the cognitive strategies that compose a reader’s and writer’s mental tool kit (Flower & Hayes, 1981), and which includes the stages of the composing process: prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing; (5) scaffolding and modeling; and (6) teaching rhetorical organization.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

A Reader’s and Writer’s Tool Kit, developed by Olson (2003, p. 8) in Appendix B, provides opportunities for creative teachers to incorporate a hallmark of culturally responsive teaching: culturally mediated instruction (Ladson-Billings, 1994). The point has been made by many scholars that teachers must relate teaching content to the cultural backgrounds of their students (e.g., Olneck, 1995; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995). Accordingly, literature to students’ preference, using their languages or representing their cultures, can be considered as a replacement or supplement to the suggested readings.

Building Vocabulary

To prepare the students for each reading assignment, the authors suggest that the instructors anticipate the lexical, syntactic, and grapheme-phoneme correspondence difficulties that EAP writers may have and try to accommodate those difficulties in advance of the actual reading to be done outside of class. In the introduction to this paper, the authors pointed out that RFW will expose NNES students to words and word families. Therefore, one can expect that EAP writers will exhibit different levels of lexical competence. Armbruster, Lehr, and Osborn (2003) distinguished three levels of word knowledge: unknown, acquainted, and established. At the unknown level, “the word is completely unfamiliar and its meaning is unknown”; at the acquainted level, “the word is somewhat familiar and the student has some idea of its basic

meaning”; at the established level, “the word is very familiar...the student can immediately recognize its meaning and use the word correctly” (p. 43).

Building vocabulary is essential for EAP writers, because, according to Grabe and Kaplan (1996), vocabulary building advances the reading comprehension process, the composing process, syntactic flexibility, and the rudiments for future learning. Given EAP writers’ potential difficulties with some words in the literature readings, the authors suggest that the reading/writing instructors use a broad spectrum of techniques for the systematic study of novel, unknown, and somewhat familiar vocabulary in each reading selection. Such a battery might include (1) cloze exercises; (2) teaching lexical sets and semantic functions; (3) establishing set discriminations; (4) practice infrequently occurring collocational groups of particular fields; (5) identification of the base form of words; (6) affix drills; (7) paired-associate compositions; (8) synonym and antonym exercises; and (9) contextualized practice with word forms (for further information, see Wright, 2015, pp. 160-61).

A Cognitive Method Based on Active Thinking

This literature-based syllabus, shown in Appendix A, is designed for a cognitive method which treats writing as a process to be accomplished and for a pedagogy which relies on active thinking. Overall, the approach to writing reflected by this syllabus is an inquiry/heuristic method in which EAP writing students are required to ask questions, impose order on data, and manipulate and extrapolate data provided or suggested by the reading selections and the class discussions of the readings. With such an approach, as a salient feature of RFW, background and source material are sorted out for writing about a specific topic, known as mining reading (Hirvela, 2004). Mining reading involves “culling” information for a particular purpose from a text (Greene, 1992). Reading can be also used to pose questions and to ask students to imitate linguistic aspects of a text such as word use, sentence structure, argument structure, and organization (Kroll, 1993; Wright, 2015), that is, writerly reading. Bruner’s (1966) spiraling technique is used to introduce and to reintroduce various cognitive methods of organization, as proper techniques focusing on the target students’ developmental level. With the spiraling principle, the same general types of assignments can be given to students at successive levels of difficulty.

A Cognitive Strategies Approach to Reading and Writing Instruction

It is recommended in this paper that EAP reading/writing instructors using a literature-based approach to writing use a cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction, which is a model of the cognitive strategies that make up a reader’s and writer’s mental tool kit (Flower & Hayes, 1981) and which includes the stages of the composing process: prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Wright (2015) notes that process writing taught through a collaborative approach, as advocated in this paper, is referred to as Writer’s Workshop (p. 242).

One of the cognitive strategies listed in the tool kit (in Appendix B) is tapping prior knowledge (mobilizing knowledge and searching existing schemata). One of the writing assignments in the syllabus involves Orwell’s ambivalent feelings toward the Burmese people and the British empire. As preparation for this assignment, EAP writing instructors could conduct a discussion with their students about the similarities, if any, and differences to what is found in the reading and their own cultures and backgrounds. In some cases, it may be necessary for the instructors to help their students build the necessary background knowledge for the reading assignment, because some EAP writing students may not have yet developed an academic primary discourse. Gee (2013) defines discourses as “ways of using language, acting, interacting, valuing, dressing, thinking, believing, and feeling (or displaying these), as well as ways of interacting with various

objects, tools, artifacts, technologies, spaces, and times so as to seek to get recognized as having a specific socially consequential identity” (p. 55).

Cummins (2013) differentiates primary and secondary discourses as follows:

Primary discourses are acquired through face-to-face interactions in the home and represent the language of initial socialization. Secondary discourses are acquired in social institutions beyond the family (e. g., school, business, religions, and cultural contexts) and involve acquisition of specialized vocabulary and functions of language appropriate to those settings. Within this conception, the academic language proficiency reflects an individual’s access to and command of the secondary discourses required to function effectively within the social sphere of schooling (p. 14).

Instructional Scaffolding

Wright (2015) defines scaffolding as “support or assistance provided to a student within his or her zone of proximal development by a more knowledgeable other (e.g. teacher, peer) to help the student learn a new concept or develop new skills” (p. 324). Olson and Land (2007) advocate instructional scaffolding in order to link reading and writing and to facilitate student learning. Such a pedagogical methodology, built on Vygotsky’s (1986) Social Constructivism and Bruner’s (1978) Progressive Constructivism, have been repeatedly discussed and promoted by other scholars (e.g., Applebee & Langer, 1983; Langer & Applebee, 1986).

Instructional scaffolds afford a gradual release of responsibility from teacher-centric instruction in the beginning to more student-centric activities, that is, from assisted teacher-led tasks to independent student performances. Scaffolding from peers can be experienced language users helping novice readers or writers learn new reading or writing skills through novel tasks (Applebee & Langer, 1983).

Graphic organizers, one of the widely used scaffoldings, require the assistance from teachers, or higher-ability students paired with lower-ability students. Constructing the gist (visualizing, making connections, forming preliminary interpretations, identifying main ideas, organizing information, expanding schemata, and adopting an alignment) lends itself to the collaborative use of graphic organizers such as text maps (setting, characters, problem/issue, and resolution), Venn diagram, and sentence starters/sentence frames as well as function words and phrases (some examples are in Appendix C) for a particular rhetorical organization. One of the assignments in the syllabus, for instance, is to describe how the portraits of Henry Ford differ in Dos Passos’ and Doctorow’s texts. The EAP writing instructors could use the scaffolding components as above, during constructing the gist and revising meaning stages of the composing process.

Teaching Rhetorical Organization

Kaplan’s (1966) seminal article on cultural thought patterns defined rhetoric as “a mode of thinking ... concerned with factors of analysis, data gathering, interpretation and synthesis” (p. 1). Cultural and social preferences for particular ways of organizing information in written texts vary from culture to culture, and possibly from time to time within a given culture (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). The study of how a person’s first language and culture influence writing in a second language is known as contrastive rhetoric, or intercultural rhetoric, as it is now sometimes referred to (Connor, 2002).

Rhetoric is about the cultural aspect of writing, and EAP writing courses enroll students who speak a variety of languages from different cultures and write using a different cultural writing model from that manifested in Standard American English academic writing. Presenting simplified descriptions of writing styles from different global language groups to EAP writing students might be helpful to them in terms of understanding how different language groups have

their own preferred ways of organizing information in written texts. It is imperative that EAP writing instructors point out that no particular rhetorical organization is better or preferred than others. The mode of rhetorical organization must fit the intended audience.

Vorhies (2015) provided the following descriptions of writing styles which could be used as a basis for explicating contrastive rhetoric in EAP writing classes.

- ENGLISH—Academic writing in English-speaking countries generally features a linear, direct argument style with clear, concrete vocabulary. Writers use a deductive approach to present information, with the main idea first, followed by supporting details.
- ROMANCE & SLAVIC LANGUAGES—European cultures (French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Czech, Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian) prefer broad, philosophical discussions presented with tangential details. The main idea is presented in the middle of the paper, and elaborate wording and sentence structure is used throughout.
- ASIAN LANGUAGES—Papers written in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean cultures usually feature abstract vocabulary and a circular, inductive approach, where details are presented first. The main idea is not presented until toward the end of the paper.
- SEMITIC LANGUAGES—Arabic-, Farsi-, and Hebrew-speaking cultures prefer a writing style that uses repetition and strings of parallel forms to support the main idea. These writings tend to include lyrical, descriptive vocabulary, and often mention family and/or religion (p. 2).

Like Grabe and Stoller (2002), we believe that student awareness of text structure can be augmented and enriched through class discussion. We will illustrate this concept in the following section in which we make suggestions on how to teach the writing assignment that solicits a description of how the portraits of Henry Ford differ in Dos Passos' and Doctorow's texts.

Using the Reader's and Writer's Tool Kit (Appendix B), EAP writing instructors could build (or bridge) their students' background knowledge about the assigned topic before reading the assigned texts by providing the following information. Dos Passos' *Tin Lizzie* is a biography of the automaker giant, Henry Ford whose company developed the world's first mass-produced automobile. The *Tin Lizzie* is a reference to Ford's Model T. The story traces Ford's success as an entrepreneur to the dissatisfaction and sadness of his autumn years. The theme of the story is that material success does not necessarily guarantee ultimate fulfillment and happiness. Students also need to be made aware that Dos Passos write *Tin Lizzie* in a poetic style, sometimes omitting punctuation, with words merged with others. His strategically placed commas make the text resemble a poem.

The EAP writing instructors need to introduce E. L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* by pointing out that Doctorow wove together fictional characters and historical figures, such as Henry Ford, and interleaved different events and ideas about success and fame in American history. *Ragtime* is a blend of stories about three fictional American families during a time of industrialization and technological development in which Henry Ford played a large role. Both Dos Passos and Doctorow inferred that burgeoning industrialization and success came with a price. Major societal changes are a theme in *Ragtime*.

During the pre-writing phase, the EAP instructors can begin instruction on rhetorical organization for this assignment by pointing out that contrast makes a point by presenting and

discussing differences between two or more topics. The writer must identify comparable points and offer concrete and germane descriptions and examples for each comparable piece of data. Writing a contrast essay involves a level of subjectivity because the writer's opinion constitutes the thesis statement or the main idea. The thesis statement (at the macro level) and the topic sentences (at the micro level) state the principal point of the contrast between the two topics. Following Grabe and Stoller (2002), we highly recommend the use of graphic representations and frames to introduce the contrast pattern of rhetorical organization through visual displays in order to generate and to organize comparable points for development of the main idea.

Graphic representations are visual illustrations of verbal statement. Frames are sets of questions or categories that are fundamental to understanding a given topic ... These graphics show at a glance the key points of the whole and their relations, helping the learner to comprehend text and solve problems (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 217).

We have adapted Grabe and Stoller's matrix to illustrate how it could be used to prepare EAP writers for the Dos Passos and Doctorow contrastive essay.

	Dos Passos	Doctorow
Attribute 1		
Attribute 2		
Attribute 3		
Attribute <i>n</i>		

Key frame questions: What things are being compared? How are they similar? How are they different?

During the pre-writing phase, the instructors would assist the students in identifying main ideas and comparable points. Next would come instruction and assistance with moving from a general idea (a contrast of Dos Passos' and Doctorow's portrayal of Henry Ford) to major support (a contrast of the two topics) and then to developmental, supporting sentences which contain details and/or examples. The instructors would also supply information and assistance with using text markers or transitional words and phrases to show how information is organized along these levels of ideas and give the students guidance about what is important in a text. Some ideas are more important than others; therefore, the EAP instructors should provide guidance on the use of coordination and subordination.

At this stage, the student writers should be able to write their first draft of the paper and submit it to the instructors and to their classmates for peer review and guidance for revising the first draft. Guided revision should be an iterative process that continues until the final written product meets the threshold for proficient writing.

Discussion and Conclusions

Conclusions

The connections between NNEST learners' reading and writing have not received the same level of analysis as the reading and writing connections of their NES counterparts. We developed this paper to fill some of those lacunae by proposing a literature-based composition course for advanced NNEST students with a rationale, a syllabus, and some pedagogy, for the purpose of bridging theory and practice.

The paper covers a very broad spectrum of topics including an examination of the close relationship between reading and writing, the many entailments and benefits of a RFW approach, culturally responsive teaching, a cognitive method based on active thinking, a cognitive approach to reading and writing instruction, instructional scaffolding, and teaching rhetorical organization and intercultural rhetoric.

Theoretical Implications

A reader of this paper will immediately notice that there are fewer writing assignments in this syllabus than one usually finds in a typical composition course. We believe that students acquire more attained writing proficiency through revision of fewer papers than writing more papers that remain unrevised. This is a hypothesis for which we have no empirical data with which to accept or reject the hypothesis, but we do know that accomplished writers reexamine their work at intervals, rereading, correcting, and making revisions iteratively.

Practical Implications

EAP writing instructors could use the proposed syllabus “as is”, or they could use it as a template for (a) creating a syllabus to fit a variety of curricular demands, (b) constructing a central theme for thematic assignments, or (c) interleaving certain units into an already existing syllabus. Some examples might be: A syllabus could be developed based on STEM readings, for example, to be English for Specific Purposes focused; the syllabus could be used for a two-semester sequence, if that luxury exists, or the writing instructors could select certain units to be interleaved into an already existing syllabus.

The prewriting activities and guided revision, as well as the use of heuristics and graphic organizers, are suggested in the syllabus because they play heavily in the writing process, and the writing process, the Writer’s Workshop, is of utmost importance in the overall success or failure of the written product.

Limitations

The readings in this syllabus emphasize the recent Anglo-American past which may be objectionable to some scholars. These readings may also require a great deal of building an adequate cache of background knowledge through culturally responsive teaching. That said, the tentative syllabus presented in this paper should be considered as an example of what can be developed, not a nomothetic syllabus. We also acknowledge that the volume in which the readings are found is old; however, the readings were chosen because they lend themselves to writing assignments which entail commonly-taught rhetorical organizations. Certainly, the last reading and writing assignment would not be suitable for some cultures, thus would need to be modified based on its target students.

Future Research

An interesting research project would be to randomly assign equally-proficient EAP students to a control group who are taught EAP composition using current handbooks and manuals and to an experimental group who are taught EAP composition using a literature-based approach. The details for conducting a true experimental design study go far beyond the scope of this paper. In addition, more research foci would embrace the connections between reading and writing across curricula/disciplines and across cultures.

References

- Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (1983). Instructional scaffolding: Reading and writing as natural language activities. *Language Arts*, 60, 165-175.
- Armbruster, B. B., Lehr, F., & Osborn, J. (2003). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read kindergarten through grade 3*. Jessup, MD: National Institute for Literacy.
- Baba, K. (2009). Aspects of lexical proficiency in writing summaries in a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(3), 191-208.
- Bhowmik, S. K., & Kim, M. (2018). Preparing Diverse Learners for University: A Strategy for Teaching EAP Students. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 498-524.
- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2004). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellence in Education.

- Bosley, L. (2008). "I don't teach reading": Critical reading instruction in composition courses. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47, 285-308.
- Bråten, L., & Strømsø, H. (2010). When law students read multiple documents about global warming: Examining the role of topic-specific beliefs about the nature of knowledge and knowing. *Instructional Science*, 38, 635-657.
- Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Bruner, J. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R. J. Jarvella, & W. J. M. Levelt (Eds.), *The child's conception of language* (pp. 241-256). New York: Springer.
- Carson, J. G. (1993). Reading for writing: Cognitive perspectives. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 85-104). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Carson, J. G. (2001). A task analysis of reading and writing in academic contexts. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 48-83). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 493-510.
- Cummins, J. (2013). BICS and CALP: Empirical support, theoretical status, and policy implications of a controversial distinction. In M. R. Hawkins (Ed.), *Framing languages and literacies: Socially situated views and perspectives* (pp. 10-23). New York: Routledge.
- Dooley, P. (2010). Students' perspectives of an EAP pathway program. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(3), 184-197.
- Downs, D. (2000). *Rethinking dogma: Teaching critical thinking in freshman composition*. Urbana, IL: Reading, English, and Communication Clearinghouse (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450377)
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Gee, J. P. (2013). Discourses in and out of school: Looking back. In M. R. Hawkins (Ed.), *Framing languages and literacies: Socially situated views and perspectives* (pp. 51-83). New York: Routledge.
- Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2008). *The Longman guide to peer tutoring*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Graham, S., & Hebert, M. A. (2010). *Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act Report*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Greene, S. (1992). Mining texts in reading-to-write. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 12(1), 151-170.
- Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hirvela, A. (2016). Academic Reading into Writing. In P. Shaw & K. Hyland (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 127-138). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Institute of International Education. (2018). *Enrollment Trends—International student data from the 2018 Open Doors Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Enrollment>
- Irmischer, W. (1979). *Teaching expository writing*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16(1), 1-20.
- Kroll, B. (1993). Teaching writing is teaching reading: Training the new teacher of ESL composition. In J. G. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 61-84). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co.
- Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1986). Reading and writing instruction: Toward a theory of teaching and learning. In E. Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 13, pp. 171-197). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Larson, M., Britt, M. A., & Larson, A. (2004). Disfluencies in comprehending argumentative texts. *Reading Psychology*, 25, 205-224.
- Lems, K., Miller, L.D., & Soro, T. M. (2017). *Building literacy with English language learners. Insights from linguistics* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lief, L., & Light, J. (1981). *The modern age* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Cox, M. (2009). Reading an ESL writer's text. In S. Bruce & B. A. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (2nd ed., pp. 42-50). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

- Mazgutova, D., & Kormos, J. (2015). Syntactic and lexical development in an intensive English for Academic Purposes programme. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 29, 3-15.
- Neff-van Aertselaer, J. (2013). Contextualizing EFL argumentation writing practices within the Common European Framework descriptors. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 198-209.
- Olneck, M. R. (1995). Immigrants and education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 310-27). New York: Macmillan Publications.
- Olson, C. B. (2003). *The reading/writing connection: Strategies for teaching and learning in the secondary classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Olson, C. B., & Land, R. (2007). A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English language learners in secondary schools. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 41, 269-303.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 609-640). New York: Longman.
- Perkins, K. & Linnville, S. E. (1987). A construct definition study of a standardized ESL vocabulary test. *Language Testing*, 4, 125-141.
- Shaw, P & Pecorari, D (2013). Source use in academic writing: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), A1-A3.
- Spivey, N. (1984). *Discourse synthesis: Constructing texts in reading and writing*. In: *Outstanding Dissertation Monograph*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Spivey, N., & King, J. R. (1989). Readers as writers composing from sources. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24(1), 7-26.
- Strickland, D. S. (1991). Emerging literacy: How young children learn to read. In B. Persky & L. H. Golubchick (Eds.), *Early childhood education* (2nd ed., pp. 337-344). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60, 568-580.
- Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1990). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 246-280). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Valeri-Gold, M., & Deming, M. P. (2000). Reading, writing, and the college developmental student. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 149-173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vorhies, H. (2015). Communicating in a global society: Understanding different cultural writing styles. Charlotte, NC: The Writing Resources Center, University of North Carolina, Charlotte. Retrieved from <https://pages.uncc.edu/unccwrc/blog/tag/contrastive-rhetoric/>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsburg, M. B. (1995). *Diversity and motivation: Culturally responsive teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wright, W. E. (2015). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Appendices

Appendix A Tentative Course Syllabus

Week	Tasks
1	Review of paragraphing, canonical theme organization and development, mechanics, etc.
2	Review: Continued. Read: Robert Pirsig's <i>Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance</i> . Discuss: writing blocks; the purpose of grading; the carrot and whip mentality; the wisdom of granting college degrees.
3	Rhetoric Organization: Cause and effect. Read: Reading assignment and discussion of the reading, vocabulary work, and reading strategies; George Orwell's <i>Shooting an Elephant</i> . Write: Introduce and teach structure vocabulary and concepts of rhetorical organization. Discuss: Discuss the specific causes for Orwell's psychological tensions brought on by

	his ambivalent feelings toward the Burmese people and the British empire.
4	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Review cause and effect.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Lewis Thomas's <i>On Cloning a Human Being</i> and Charles Darwin's <i>Natural Selection</i>.</p> <p>Write: According to Thomas, the successful cloning of a human being would face numerous difficulties.</p> <p>Discuss: Discuss the problems Thomas foresees, especially the problem of environment (including people as part of environment). Then on the basis of Charles Darwin's <i>Natural Selection</i>, discuss why Darwin would agree or disagree with Thomas.</p>
5	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Classification.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Flannery O'Connor's <i>A Good Man is Hard to Find</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce and teach structure vocabulary and concepts of rhetorical organization; Classify the simple, ordinary details about a normal family on a summer vacation in O'Connor's story.</p>
6	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Chronological order.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Robert Coover's <i>Quenby and Ola, Swede and Carl</i>.</p> <p>Discuss: Discuss the chronological order of events in the story.</p> <p>Write: Introduce and teach structure vocabulary and concepts of rhetorical organization; the events of this story are confused chronologically and the confusion is compounded by the fact that the events and imagination are never perfectly differentiated.</p>
7	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Contrast.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; John Dos Passos's <i>Tin Lizzie (USA)</i> and E. L. Doctorow's <i>Ragtime</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce and teach structure vocabulary and concepts of rhetorical organization; How do the portraits of Henry Ford differ in Dos Passos and Doctorow?</p>
8	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Comparison.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Arthur Miller's <i>Death of a Salesman</i> and Tennessee Williams's <i>The Glass Menagerie</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce and teach structure vocabulary and concepts of rhetorical organization; In an important sense, these plays are both "memory" plays and "family" plays. Write a comparison of the different fathers, or mothers, or brothers in the two plays.</p>
9	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Cause and effect.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; George Orwell's <i>Politics and the English Language</i>.</p> <p>Write: Why do people use euphemisms in your own language and culture and what are the results?</p>
10	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Classification.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Tom Wolfe's <i>The Me Decade and the Third Great Awakening</i>.</p> <p>Write: Classify the details of an Erhard Seminars Training (EST) Course.</p>
11	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Personal opinion.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Dwight D. Eisenhower et al.'s <i>The Vietnamization of Vietnam</i>, and Robert Bly's <i>Counting Small Boned Bodies</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce structure vocabulary and rhetorical organization; Discuss what you</p>

	perceive to be the profound effects of the Vietnam war on the U.S. and its people.
12	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Hypothesis.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Daniel Lang's <i>A Vapor Moving North-Northwest</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce structure vocabulary and rhetorical organization; If there were a nuclear war, would the precautions and measures taken to protect people from radio-activity be sufficient?</p>
13	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Explanation.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; W. H. Auden, <i>Who's Who</i>, and <i>The Unknown Citizen</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce structure vocabulary and rhetorical organization; In the contrast of the great man—to be found in <i>Who's Who</i>—with the insignificant one—to be found in both <i>Who's Who</i> and <i>The Unknown Citizen</i>—Auden suggests some psychological reasons for the differences between the men and then turns the title into an implicit question: Who is really important, and to whom? Explain to someone whom you don't know who is really important to you and why.</p>
14	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Analogy.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Loren C. Eiseley's <i>The Bird and the Machine</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce structure vocabulary and rhetorical organization; Eiseley compares the bird to the machine. Choose two concepts, entities, persons, etc. with which you are familiar and draw an analogy between them.</p>
15	<p>Rhetoric Organization: Prediction.</p> <p>Read: Reading assignment and discussion, etc.; Elaine Morgan, <i>The Descent of Woman</i>.</p> <p>Write: Introduce structure vocabulary and rhetorical organization; Using Morgan's article as your base, write your own prediction about the future effects of easy contraception.</p>

The readings and the assignments are from Lief and Light (1981).

Appendix B
Cognitive Strategies: A Reader's and Writer's Tool Kit (Olson, 2003, p. 8)

Planning and Goal Setting	Monitoring
Developing procedural and substantive plans	Directing the cognitive process
Creating and setting goals	Regulating the kind and duration of activities
Establishing a purpose	Confirming reader/writer is on track
Determining priorities	Signaling the need for fix up strategies
Tapping Prior Knowledge	Revising Meaning: Reconstructing the Draft
Mobilizing knowledge	Backtracking
Searching existing schemata	Revising meaning
Asking Questions and Making Predictions	Seeking validation for interpretations
Generating questions re: topic, genre, author/audience, purpose, etc.	Analyzing text closely/digging deeper
Finding a focus/directing attention	Analyzing author's craft
Predicting what will happen next	Reflecting and Relating
Fostering forward momentum	Stepping back
Establishing focal points for confirming or revising meaning	Taking stock
Constructing the Gist	Rethinking what one knows
Visualizing	Formulating guidelines for personal ways of living
Making connections	Evaluating
Forming preliminary interpretations	Reviewing
Identifying main ideas	Asking questions
Organizing information	Evaluating/assessing quality
Expanding schemata	Forming criticisms
Adopting an alignment	

OLSON, CAROL BOOTH, READING/WRITING CONNECTION: STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE SECONDARY CLASSROOM, 3rd, ©2011. Reprinted by permission of Pearson Education, Inc., New York, New York.

Appendix C

Sentence Starters, Sentence Frames, and Function Vocabulary for Comparison and Contrast

Comparison	Contrast
In comparison...	In contrast...
Likewise...	And yet...
Similarly...	On the contrary...
In the same way...	This is in contrast to...
Complementary to this...	On the other hand...
	In contrast to...
	...disputes...
	...contradicts...
	...differs from...
	Although...
	Conversely...
	...; however, ...